1894-95
(L.R.)

F.C. No. 136 of 94
Serial No. 1 to 23

Sub:- Appeal of Chikkaligaraja
Urs of Mysore, regarding
the Kebbigatta Kaval
Attikuppa Taluk

No. 1. Enc: 2 Inam Regts and 3 Petns

3

is about 158 Khandees as can be seen from a measurement Patti prepared under Kole narsipur amildar's order no. 688 dated 31st December 1873, although the survey department has now unjustly recognized a much smaller area of ~~6080~~ about 242 acres as Inam,

(4) that the entire area referred to in the above Patti has always been in the enjoyment of his family.

The vernacular papers submitted by the Deputy Commr of Mysore with his letter no. 1179 dated 26th ~~July~~ April 1895 only relate to the "dur-Khasto" made on former occasions ~~1871 to 1880~~ 1871 by the neighbouring ryots for lands claimed by appellants' family as forming part of the Inam lands.

In 1871 there was an application by an

Thimmappa of madapur
for a certain land
which was claimed by
Linga Raja urs as form
ing part of his Inam
Kavals. In connection
with that case the
measurement, Patti above
referred to was prepared.
The Patti states that
the measurement was
then made of all the
lands shewn by Linga
Raja urs's gumasta
Gundappa as belonging
to the said urs. It
does not state that
the measurement was
made only of such lands
as had actually been
granted as Inam to the
appellants' family. The
area therein recorded
is about 158 khandees of which
a portion was fit for
wet cultivation. The
actual dry measurement
is given as ~~158~~ nearly
138 khandees. There
are about seventeen
signatures affixed to the
Patti. Soorappa Shan

(23)

Office note

A. S no 66 of 1894-95

Appellant: Chikka
Linga Raja urs
of Mysore -

The appellant
complains that Ichal
-gudde, Kalenahalli
and Dabbeghutta Kara
lands in Kikkeri Hobli
Krishnarajapete Taluk
which had been granted
to his family in 1827
as Sarvamanyam by
H. H. the late Maharaja
Krishna Raja Wodeyar
Bahadur were improp-
-ly treated as minor
Inams, that a large
amount of Rs 182 has
been charged thereon
as Khaleat and that
the local authorities
have been, accepting
Coercive measures
for the recovery of

of the said Khaleat.

The Appellant's allega-tions are

(1) that the above lands granted to his family as Sarvamanyam were not Government Lands but had originally formed a portion of the Palace Estates and as such are not liable to be treated like other Inams.

(2) that the sum of 17 pagodas 3 fanams referred to in the Sannad is not the actual levy of the lands granted as Sarvamanyam but only the average realization from the sale of the "Kule" grass standing on these lands after all the good grass "Nilakarai" had been ~~grazed~~ grazed by the cattle.

(3) that the area of the said Inam lands

Plan. A

5

bhag of Dabbe
Venkatramappa Shan
-bhag of Madapur refus
to Sign the Patti stating
that the measurement
therein recorded was
incorrect.

Gundappa Gumasta
of Linga Raja was gave
a statement in that
case before the arbitra
that the Sannad under
which the Kaval lands
had been granted as
Sarvamanyam merely
mentioned that the two
Kavals Dehalgudde
and Kalenahalli of
17 Pagodas 3 fanams
were granted and did
not give any particular
of their area, that there
was a Copy of a Takeed
dated 1st m-d of Maya
-Sira of the year Krothi
issued by Linga Raja
Urs to one Bore Gowda
who had been the gutta
-dar of the said Kaval
lands which gave
the total area thereof

26.12.73

made by the Inamdar prior to the measure-ment and demarcation of the Gomal lands of the above 6 villages and that he had no other dakhale to show what the actual area of the Sarvamanyam land was.

In the above case, of a purkhast made in 1871 by Thimmappa, the Amildar recorded his opinion that though there was no satisfactory evidence either in the Taluk records or with the Inamdar or with the Shanbhag regarding the area of the Inam kavals yet as the Entire area that had been measured (as per Patti of 1874) was in the enjoy-ment of the Inamdar the land applied for should not be granted to the applicant till the Inam Settlement took place.

At the Inam settle-ment only two kavals

+ vide calen the file

Ichalgudde and Kalena
halli had at first
been recognized. The
other Kaval viz Dabbe
-ghutta had been ordered
to be resumed as it had
not been included in
the Sannud. Linga Raj
urs appealed against
that order and after
-wards the latter Kaval
was also recognized as
Inam and confirmed
to the Inamdar under
the ~~Chief~~ authority conveyed
in the Chief Secretary's
letter No. 4231/79 dated
23d August 1886.

The above Kavals
were confirmed to the
Inamdar on ⅛ quit
rent. The quit rent
was fixed with reference
to the "beriz" as recorded
in the Vasool Baki
account for 1831-32, in
the Jamabandi Goshwara
of 1833-34, in the Kaum
jasthi account for 1836-
and in the Sannud.

The Inam Supt has
recorded the followi

this letter & the papers
connected therewith are
put up with the

Ichalgudde P 11-6 fums
Kalenahalli 3-3
Dabbeghutta 2-4
Total 17-3

beriz 17 pagodas 3 fums
= Rs 50-5-2

the Inam Settlt Registr
Kalenahalli & Dabbe
ghutta

as 135 Khandes :-

Ichalgoode Kaval 66
Kalenahalli Kaval 64
Dabbeghutta Kaval 5

Total 135 Khandes,

that there was another Patti prepared by one Thimmarayappa Shanbhy of Bharathipur wherein also the area of the Inam Kavals above referred to was given as 135 Khandes, that besides the above there was no other "Takhale", that the area given in the above Takeed had been ascertained from the Amrit Mahal Bakshi, that the original accounts from which the Bakshi had given the information were not available, that he could not explain why in the Patti prepared by the Bharathipur Shanbhog which was only a Rasooli ~~Book~~ Patti the area of the Kavals had been given and that the area mentioned in the Panchaishi Patti

rest treated as good land."

× ×

22.7.

The Excess Settlement Rep= received from the Survey Superint= shows :—

(1) Amount of Bijavani as per Inam Superintendent's Settlement :—
(a) in Kalenhalli Rs. 43-5-5.
(b) " Dabbepatta " 6-15-9.

(2) Total extent in Sett= enjoyment :—

	acres.	guntas	assessed
(a) Dry in Kalenhalli	422	2	256-8--
(b) Kharab "	10	4	—
(c) Wet in Dabbepatta	27	31	77-8--
	459	37	334--

(3) Extent allowed as Inam :—

	acres.	guntas.	assessed
Dry . . .	224	24	129-12--
Wet . . .	7	16.	21--
~~Kharab~~	~~10~~	~~4~~	—
	232	~~4~~	150-12--

(4) Extent treated as Khaloat :—

	acres.	guntas.	assessed
Dry . . .	197	18	126-12--
Wet	20	15	56-8
Kharab	10	4	—
	227	37	183-4-

Subt. for orders.

Rec'd 24/8

Send this petition to the Survey Subdr. & call for a report & state his attention

particularly to
the allegation
that the
money value received
is only the realization
of the ~~debts~~ rubble
stone & not the
stone as finished
& set here
the extent of
Mr. Mann
was debited
if there was
no mention
of the extent
or agreement

19/12/95

Chief Accountant
19-12-95
Mr. 20/12
Drafted
24/12/95

In his letter of 2/3/96, the Page
Survey Supt repeated
the contention
that the ~~item~~ value
of the pet. that the money
value received was a sett.
of his account as between
them, though probably wrong,

7

Ichalgunde and Kalena-
halli had at first
been recognized. The
other Kaval in Dabbe-
ghutta had been ordered
to be resumed as it had
not been included in
the Sannad. Lingaraj
urs appealed against
that order and after-
wards the latter Kaval
was also recognized as
Inam and confirmed
to the Inamdar under
the authority conveyed
in the Chief Secretary's
letter No. 4231/79 dated
23d August 1886.

The above Kavals
were confirmed to the
Inamdar on ⅛ quit
rent. The quit rent
was fixed with reference
to the "Beriz" as recorded
in the Vasool Baki
account for 1831-32, in
the Jamabandi Goshwara
of 1833-34, in the Kanni
Jaitha account for 1836-37
and in the Sannad.

The Inam Supt has
recorded the following

⊗ This letter & the papers connected therewith are put up with the file.

Flag B

⊗ Ichalgunde P 11 · 6 Annas
Kalenahalli 3 - 3
Dabbeghutta 2 - 4
Total 17 · 3

Beriz 17 Pagodas 3 Fanams
= Rs 50 - 5 - 2

Vide Inam Settlt Registr
of Kalenahalli & Dabbe
ghutta

order:

"The area (of the Kawl) is not given in the Sannad, nor in the accounts and the land will be defined by the Survey Department.

vide Inam enquiry Registers.

The papers in the file do not show how the area was defined by the Survey Department, what area was recognized as Inam, what was treated as Excess and what amount was charged as Khalsa. (No papers have been received from the Survey Department.



The order passed by the Survey Supt on a petition presented to him by the Appellant runs as follows:

"In the quit rent Register received from the Inam Department the Inam was mentioned as minor Inam. In accordance therewith the "Vahivat" Statements were also received from the Taluk. As much area as could be recognized as Inam under the Excess Rules was allowed and the

not borne out by the
terms of the Grant
granting the Canal
(2) That as regards the
Pet[r]'s contention that
an alternative measure-
ment in 1874 the Canal
measured about 75 acres
while the actual area
by Survey are only about
45 acres, an enquiry
might be made
(3) That from the Regr of
enquiry, the Inam Settl.
Offr that, in the case of
these Canals, the area
was not mentioned in
the Summary or the accounts
& that the land would
be defined by the Survey
Department

mend of which is equal to
3 × (Rs 50 - 5 - 2) or Rs 150 - 15 - 6.
As a matter of fact pet[r] has been given Land assessed Rs 150 - 12 - 11 the rest being brought under exemption.
As the Survey Supt. thinks that the berij represents a sort of kulburni assessment, he recommends, in modification of the above allocation,

(1) That the petr should pay full assessment on the wet Lands (27 a 9 g - 31 assessed 77 - 8 Rs as)

2) That the assessment on the dry Lands (4 a 32 g - 6 assessed 256 - 8 - 11 Rs as p) should be struck off

3) That the petr should be permitted to enjoy the grazing on the unassessed waste Lands (measuring 1581 a - 12 g) subject to the

by the Inam Deptl Sha
of the 10 p c of such ex
by the rule hitherto in for
confirmed as Inam,
& the said authorized e
the other half being c
with the full Survey a

Provided that in no
Land bearing Surve
of more than 3 tim
Survey valuation o
extent of Inam an
the Inam Deptl Shall
continued as Inam
When 3 times such
valuation falls shor

{ Berij of the Inam =
Survey assessment of
Land claimed by petr

Excess = 283 - 1
½ of this = 141 - 1

Berij of the Inam + ½ the
= Rs 182 - 2 - 7
Which is greater th
the Inam berij

proviso that Govt. retain
the power to give out
Land for bona fide cultiv-
ation up to a certain
area say 1000 acres.

= This case resembles that
of the Uttaradi Mutt
of Hole Narsipur in
which the agent has
been called upon to
file a written State-
ment. In this latter case, the
Muzarai Supt. recommen-
ended the application of
the Standing rule, the
Mutt agent contending that
no excess shd be charged
& the Survey Supt. contending
that the Mutt should

proviso that Govt. retain
the power to give out
Land for bona fide cultiv-
ation up to a certain
area say 1000 acres.

= This case resembles that
of the Uttaradi Mutt
of Hole Narsipur in
which the agent has
been called upon to
file a written State-
ment. In this latter case, the
Muzarai Supt. recommen-
ended the application of
the Standing rule, the
Mutt agent contending that
no excess shd be charged
& the Survey Supt. contending
that the Mutt should

Thereupon the Surveyor
was requested to enquire
into all the facts & to
furnish a complete
report. Meanwhile the
collection of the assessment
on the excess was directed
to be stayed

In his letter of 29th May D
the Surveyor states
that
(1) That he could find no trace
of the alleged measure-
ment in 1874
(2) That, as the petitioner
that the beginning
in the map is a spot
but a small assessment seems
reasonable, he is inclined
to propose a revised
settlement.

The Extent of the Lands

proviso that Govt reserves
the power to give out
Land for bona fide culti-
vation up to a certain
area say 1000 acres
= This case resembles that
of the Uttaradi Mutt
of Hole Narsipur in
which the agent has
been called upon to
file a written State-
ment
In this latter case, the
Muzarai Supt recom-
ended the application of
the Standing rule, the
Mutt agent contending that
no excess fee be charged
& the Survey Supt contending
that the Mutt should

A copy of the Samnad is put a
in the file as per orders of the 2nd C.
2. As regards the ~~Samnad~~ rep
regarding the liability of lan
which were once in the possess
of the Palace & which subsequent
changed hands to be assessed
~~referred to in the order~~ requir
by the 2nd Councillor a search
was made and it was not possible
to trace. Probably this ~~is~~ may be a
Rev Branch file. The file relating
to the Lands attached to the Sidlu
Sri Lemple in the Mysore Dt.
(Mysore Taluk?)
may give some clue regarding
this. This was dealt with in the
Revenue Branch.

Bbn (The Councillor's note may
21/6/99. refer to the case of Andapur
Ranganathan vs the Devaraj Arsukt
Amghan) to Rev branch for
favour of putting up the ref
wanted by the Councillor, if pertaining
to that Branch // 21/6/99

Resumed to 2nd Councillor with
the Samnad dated 21st

(21 22

One or other of which may be the
one refd to. The file relating to
Narayan Bahadur's lands does not
seem to have been ~~had the~~ seen by the
Committee 30/6/99.

Read
Jun
1899.

I think we are
in a position to
decide this case now.
The claim is
for the large extent
of land originally
described being declared
Sarva Inam infusion
of the Peta
The settlement
which has been
already effected
imposes a quit-rent
of 2 as on each rupee
of assessment —
There was no speci-
fication of the situation
of the land with
extent — the only
claim for fixing
the assessment
Inam —

not- derive the benefit of
the ordinary rules.
The fact- appears to be
that these "Naval Treaties"
seem to be sui generis
& lie beyond the sphere
of the ordinary rules

HL 3/11/25

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 66 of 1894-95.

Appellant. ~~Vs.~~ ~~Respondent.~~

Chikka Vira Raja Ors
of Mysore -

Subject:— dispute regarding the Inam Kavale lands of Dabbegatta, Kelaguddi and Kalenahalli in the Krishnarajapet Taluk.

(24 3. Chetwode R. assn
Card Garage

reference only to the
legality of ~~subjecting~~
~~to tax~~ enquiring the
steps under Khalsa
assessment. The
S. Supt very properly
gives weight to the
contention of the Petr
that the so-called Cess
is not properly the
assessment under
the T. Cesses Act is.
a sort of Octroi duty
The alternative ~~view~~
solution which this
new Income duty is
described by the S. Supt
in paras 6 & 7 of his
letter & meets the
view

Please see

This reasoning commends
itself as very fair
and ought adopted.
with a slight modi
fication. It will be
leaving the Petr under
vague and uncertain
conditions if his Income
is made dependent
upon the application
by others for any portion

this land for cultivation.
It would be more
Equitable Wallach the
Condition this assignment
ment. The assignment may
be held in abeyance
as long as the Sett adheres
with terms of the Award
and enjoys the land
only as pasture or grazing
ground - but if he
cultivates any portion of
it such portion is from
the assignment in
thereforward be held
under the Award subject to this
modification the
recommendation of the
S Supt is accepted and
and he will be authorized
to issue the settlement
in either of the alternative
forms that is way as
at present settled already
or as varied by him
whichever may be
accepted by the Sett.

18.2.00

I believe this has to
go before Tel Committee also.

Send 5 Tel Committee (with 2 ref pkgs)
Thy 20/2/00

Ref for receipt of
20/2/00

In any case the
Guardian will
have no right
to take away
I doubt this
other land

19

appl's grandfather's interest.

Records to be furn'd by 2nd Committee

10/2/99

Have read the record - I should see the summons - a legible copy to be sent up.

There was another file regr the liability of lands which were in the possession of the Palace & which subsequently changed hands) to be assessed - I should like to see that file also.

12.6.99

(22 2)

Chellakumaraya Nayak
& anor dis Tirukkoyilur

23

~~Case~~ which was available was the money value of the land - It was accordingly left to the S. Deputy to fix the value & and extent of the Inam and allocate it -

The Inam was admittedly Inaidam Inam, and was accordingly dealt with under the rules of

The Petr had the benefit of the crops sanctioned in his favour - and the rest was assessed as Khalsat.

The objection taken by the Petr ~~Case~~ to the above settlement is based on several grounds - One of them is that it shd first be treated as Nivi Inam - Nothing has been urged in

Page 636 Ptn
Rev Pet -
x G.O. No 5646-54 S 12/12/87
Cn 128

(23 Ald

support of this ground which must therefore fail - The next objection is that being the Khasgi land of H.H. the Maharaja's household and the alienation bee in favour of the Pet. being out of the Private Estate of the late Maharaja the land in question should not be subjected to any assessment. This argument is not based & must be rejected as being without any force - The principle that such lands are liable to be assessed when they have ceased to be of the Palace uses is recognised by us in cases (Secundrabad - Mysore Palace - Mysore) where there is a special direction to the contrary and this case does not fall within that category. The Sravana Inam has for its basis an administrative Sanad granted by the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wadeyar Bahadur in his Sovereign Capacity and was properly dealt with by the Inam Deptt.

The question then has

7

		A	Rs as
Kalenahalli & Ichalpoor	Dry	422-8-2	256-8-0
	Kharab	10-6-0	
Dabbeghatta wet		27-31	77-8-0
Total		459-37	Rs 334-0-0

Unassessed

	A
Kalenahelli	100-0
Ichalpoor	1014-0
Dabbeghatta	35-2
Total	1149-6-0
Grand total	1609-3-0.

Appeal of Mr A.C. Lingaraje Urs re Debbeghatta Kaval lands

Facts of the Case

Petr has been in the enjoyment of the marginally noted Kaval in the K. Rajapet Tq under the authority of a Nirup dt 19-2-1827 granted by the late H.H. Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur. The Inam was enjoyed by the Inamdar up to the time of the Inam as Sarva Inam ie up to 1878-79 When the Inam Debbaghatta Kaval was resumed as it had not been specifically mentioned in the Nirup and charged it with full assessment. The other two Kavals were however confirmed as Sarva Inam on a Quit Rent equal to 1/8 th assessment as the Nirup did not allow the grantee full powers of alienation

under cultivation at any time
full assessment was
to be levied on such portion
thereafter forward.
In the light of these orders
instructions were issued for
levying the Jodi and assessment on
the lands from the date of the
receipt of the Khatas register ie
from 1893-94 to the end of
1915-16 & for getting an accurate
account prepared of the
Demand, Collection & balance
taking into consideration
the appellant's claim for the
refund asked for in the plaint.
It was ascertained that
a sum of Rs 1476-0-4 was
due from the pltf & it was
communicated to him on
5.2.16.
The pltf subsequently complained
on 18.9.16 that the question
of Debhasphatta lands has
not been disposed of, and
after enquiry a formal
endorsement was issued by
on 21.9.16 to the effect that
as the right to enjoy as Inamdar
Inam was limited only to the
assessed and unassessed dry lands
the levy of assessment in
respect of the wet lands from
1893-94 was quite in accord

with the orders of Govt passed ~~with~~
in 1900 & 1914.

His appeal against this order to
the Rev: Com^r was rejected.
~~and the~~ An appeal was then
preferred before ~~the Govt~~ Govt contending
that the last order be set aside
as the meaning of the order
of 1900 was made clear only in
the order of 1914 ~~he should~~ has
he allowed the wet lands in
Debbeghatta to ~~allow~~ remain as
grazing ground all the time under the impression
that if they should be to allowed to
remain no assessment will be
charged. ~~the order of the Rev Com^r~~
~~should be set aside~~

Govt declined to revise the
orders of the Rc on the ground
that the clearing up of an old
order by a new one does
not mean that the intention
of Govt to levy assessment
is to take effect from the
date of the later order & that
the order of 1914 makes the whole
Case res judicata.

Hence the Memorials —

When
In 1882-83 during the
Talak was resurveyed Debbeghatta
Natal lands were Constituted
into Rev: Surv: Nos 3, 4, 6, 53, 54, 55
56, & 57 with extent &
Assessment as noted in the
margin —
As per this Survey
Valuation Rs 77-8 was
demanded from the
Inamdar in respect of Total
Debbeghatta Naval lands from
1883-84.
The Inamdar protested
against the resumption
of the Inam itself on
the ground that the Mulgaval
Inam of 17 Varahas, 3 Hanas.
granted to him included also
Debbeghatta Naval though not
expressly mentioned in the
Nirup
The insistent demands
made by the Rev: Deptt
for payment of this Kandayam
induced the ~~Appellants~~ to
appeal to Govt which led
to the issue of Govt No R 6404 & Rel 759-95
29-3-1900 directing that

Survey No	A	G	Rs
4	4	10	10-0-0
6	2	35	7-8
53			
54	4	29	16-0
55	5	2	18-0
56	3	33	12-0
57	3	37	9-8
	2	22	6-8
			Rs 77-8

the assessment which would
be realised by Govt. by
giving the land to others
for cultivation be held
in abeyance as long as the
pet.r adheres to the terms
of the lease and enjoys
the land as pasture or
fuel ~~ground~~ ground ~~with~~ are
~~~~ observation that if the pet.r
however cultivates any
portion of it the Assessment
on such portion should be levied.
In accordance with this
decission as the excess
brought under khaloat was
limited to the wet lands
of Hebbegatta, the Inamdar
claimed a refund of the
amount paid by him
till then under protest
though the appellant was
entitled to the refund of a
portion of
the amount paid by him
~~till then~~ towards the
Halenahalli lands, no amount
was refunded to him on
the score that larger amounts
were still outstanding against
him in the accounts.
~~~~

the appellant however
contended that the Rev.
Authorities had no power
to levy the assessment till
the Settlt has revised & the
Survey Supdt on the lines
indicated in the G.O. of
9-2-1900 - When the D.C
Mysore addressed the Survey
Supdt in the matter ~~the Supdt~~
this Officer is reported to have
sent the revised khaloat
register in accordance
with G.O. No R 9043/LA183-13 dt
of 23-5-14 which declared
that the Inamdar's right
to enjoy as Kulgaval
free of assessment was
intended to be limited only
to the unassessed lands &
the assessed dry lands
and that in respect of the
wet lands measuring 29-31
assessed at Rs 77-8-0 full
assessment should be
recovered from the Inamdar.
It was also stipulated that
the lands set apart as Kulgaval
had to be used only as pasture
or grazing ground & that if
any portion of it were brought

D. S. N.

33

I submit herewith, as called for in the Private Secretary's No. 186 dated the 10th Aug 1918, the records connected with the memorial of Messrs. Singaravelu Mudaliyar, praying that the levy of assessment on the wet lands of Dabbeghatta included in the Krishnagiri Taluk may be waived, till the final orders in the matter

P.W.D

2. The history of the case from its inception is given in the Office Note pages 1 to 21 in G.O. No. 595 P.W. dated 7th March 1900, which contains directions as to how the lands in the

G.T.

petitioners enjoyment
in the Nanguinalley
noted 3 Kawals. Should
be treated as regard
payment of assessment
on the different classes
of land, was based on
the decision of the Council
Committee (Pages 916 to 25 C.
of the Office notes.)

Kalenahalli
Jehalgudde
Dabbeghatta.

3. A doubt having
arisen as to the correct
interpretation of the
Govt order of March 1900,
it was clearly stated
in letter no. Q. 7043 -
LR. 183-12-4 of 23rd may 1914. to the Survey Supt-
that the petr. should pay
full Survey assessment
(77-8-0) on 24-31 of
land in Dabbeghatta,
his right to enjoy as
Melgaval fees of assessment
being limited only
to the unassessed land
and assessed dry land. =

(vide S. Supt's letter no 150 & 30.6.13)

H

(A) May 7.

25

+ Flag J

The decision on the petitioner's appeal to Govt. in the matter of his being exempted from payment of assessment on the Court Lands on the score of his not having cultivated them, Govt. orders are contained in his office Note in the recorded collection LR. 219-17. The finality replied to the petitioner that the question decided in May 1914 cannot be re-opened is based on the 2d. Members order - the present Memorial to His Highness is for reconsideration of that order -

+ Flag K

Asst
7/9/18

7.9.18

10.9.18

D. S. N. 2142

716

I submit herewith as called for in Private Secretary's No 186 dated the 10th August 1915 the records connected with the Memorial of M/s A. C. Lingaraje Urs, Mysore, praying that the levy of assessment on the wet lands in Dabbeghatta Inam in the Krishnarajapet Taluk, may be waived up to the date of the final orders of Govt in the matter.

The facts of the case are briefly as follows:—

The pet[r] was in the enjoyment of the marginally noted Inam lands in the Krishnarajapet Tq as Sirra Inam under the authority of a Nirup dt 19.2.1827 granted by the late H.H Sri Krishna-raja Wadeyar Bahadur. The Inam was so enjoyed up to the time of the Inam Settlement, [illegible]. As this was a minor maidan Inam, and as in the case of Kasekhandas, the area was not mentioned in the Sanad or the accounts, the Exact Extent had to be defined by the Survey Deptt under the rules in Govt Proceedings No 5046-54/Cir 1280, 12.12.1887

Gut[s] Byan

Assessed lands		A	G	Assmt
Kalenahalli & Ichalpodu	Dry	422	2	Rs 256-8-0
	Kharab	10	4	— —
Dabbeghatta	wet	27	31	77-8-0
Total assessed lands		459	37	Rs 334-0-0

Unassessed lands	A	G
Kalenahalli	100	14
Ichalpodu	1014	—
Dabbeghatta	35	2
Total Unassessed	1149	6

Vide Notes LR 219-17
81-6-page 10

...understanded by the
D.C from ... the
... Inamdar ... appealed
first to The Rev: Comr
and then to Govt
protesting against the
levy on the following grounds
here taken portions in
brackets in appeal

1. In the office Note-
put up in the Case
the View was taken
that since there seemed
to be a bona fide
doubt about the
application
or according which the
1900, which was only
authoritatively settled by the in 1914,
and the decision was
communicated to the pet[r]

Thereupon
The Second member of
Council Ramaswamy observed
as follows in his minute 8.1.18.
"Clearing up of an old order
by a new one does not mean
that the intention of Govt to levy
is to take effect only from the
date of the latter - this is in
fact the view in the note.
The Inamdar had expressly
agreed to the arrangement.
I do not see how the orders
can be so interpreted as indicated
in para 13 of the notes. Please
see 5 & 6 of notes in Collection
of papers file No 183.
Note of Mr Thambuchetty also
is clear on the point.
The order in Para (F) makes
the whole case res judicata
I see no reason to reopen
the pet[r] was given amendo-
-ment on these lines.
The present petition is for
a reconsideration of this
bona fide refrained from cultiv-
the wet lands and as this

only in Feb 76, it
was impracticable to levy
assessment from an anterior
date & ~~sugg~~ ~~suggested~~ and
it was suggested that it
may be ordered to be
levied from 16-17.

The details of such allocation made by the Survey Deptt are furnished below, as noted ~~in the Excess Settlement register~~ G

(1) Amount ~~of Khirajabad~~ Excess adjusted by the Inam Settlt Deptt

(a) for Kalmahalli & Ichalgudda } Rs 43-5-5

(b) for Dabbeghatta Rs 6-15-9

(2) Total extent of assessed lands in Petr enjoyment -

	A. G.	Asst
(a) Dry in Kalmahalli & Ichalgudda	422-2-	256-8-
(b) Kharab —	10-4.	...
(c) Wet in Dabbeghatta	27-31.	77-8-
Total	459-37	Rs 334-0-

(3) Extent allowed as Inam: —

	A. G.	asst
Dry —	224-24	129-12-0
Wet —	7-16-	21-0-
	232...	Rs 150-12-0

(4) Extent treated as Khalsa

	A G	asst
Dry —	197-18	126-12-0
Wet —	20-15-	56-8-0
Kharab —	10-4-	.....
Total	227-37	183-4-0

The only material objection to this ~~was~~ urged by the Petr was with reference to the legality of bringing the excess under Khalsa assessment. On this point the Survey Supdt has noted in his letter No 2598 6.10.98 Para (2) D as follows: —

38

"Para 6. The case is not an easy one
"to settle, satisfactorily. If the
"Claimant claims the lands on
"full rights as contained in the
"Survey Grantee he cannot complain
"of the excess which has been
"charged. If he seeks to explain
"how so large an area is held on
"payment of so small a Beriz,
"by asserting that the tenure
"was somewhat of the character
"of Kulbanni or Grazing ——
"assessment then he cannot
"claim the full rights of Survey
"tenure.

Para 7. "I Consider that
Chikkalingaraj Urs should
pay full assessment upon
24-31 assessed at Rs 77-8-0
in Dabbeghatta, that the 432-6
in Kalenahalli assessed at Rs 258-
which are practically waste
should have the assessment
struck off & that in the
whole of the unassessed land in
the three havals Kalenahalli,
Dabbeghatta & Echalgudda Govt
should permit Chikkalingaraj Urs
to enjoy Grazing, with however
the reservation that Govt retains
the power to give out land for
bonafide cultivation up to a
certain area say a 1000 acres
In their order No 6404-6 P.Z. 59895
of 9.3.1900 Govt concurred with the
recommendations of the Survey
Supdt with a slight modification

E

that instead of the Inamdar's tenure being made to depend upon his application & theirs for any portion of his land for cultivation, it would be equitable to attach the condition to his own enjoyment. They therefore directed that the assessment ~~may~~ be held in abeyance as long as the pet[r] adhered to the terms of the Inam and enjoyed the land only as pasture + that if he should cultivate any portion of it, the assessment on such portion should be thenceforward levied - The Survey Supt[t] was also authorised by this order to consult the wishes of the Inamdar and revise the Settlement in either of the alternative forms — either as already settled by him or as proposed now by him — which ever way he ~~may~~ elected on the pet[n] —

A doubt having arisen, as to the correct interpretation of the aforesaid Govt order ~~of 1902~~ it was ~~Chang Ala~~ ~~Dy Collr's letter No R 7043/21 183-12-4~~ F

Reply 23-5-14 to the Survey Supt[t] informing him Secy's letter No R 7043/21 183-12-4 dated 23-5-14 that the pet[r] should pay full assessment (Rs 77-8-0) on 27 Gs of wet land in Dabbespatla his right to enjoy as Inamdar free of assessment being limited only to the unassessed lands and assessed dry lands. —

Another petn was preferred to Govt by the Inamdar requesting that he be exempted from payment of assessment on the wet lands on the score of his not having cultivated them —

The Survey Supt[t] in his letter No: sought ~~the decision~~ as to whether the (here insert abstract of Survey Supt's letter) direction contained in para 4 of the G.O. of 9-3-00 (here insert portion within brackets & flag M) The decision was Communicated to the Inamdar in ... Best assessment the

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 (9)

No. 365

Name of Petitioner. Cariappa Nanjappa

Village.

Taluk. Mysore

District.

Date of Arzi. 30-7-94

Date of Receipt. 1-8-1894

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner states that he himself & Ezhaigouda, Kariaiah and Dasaigouda in the Kandanayakat Cahil were granted as Inam by the Chamaraja in the year Karnagam and they had been in his family enjoyment since and that the Survey Department without assigning any notice to the Inamdars divided the lands into Survey numbers and levied a fee of Rs 182-4-

Ltr. 136-94-1

The Collector
Mysore

I am directed to request that you will cause the enclosed Petition to be disposed of and the result reported to this office in due course.

Bangalore
1st August 1894

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
[illegible]
for Secretary to Government

The account should be stopped or must pay the amount demanded. Appeal against the order of the Dist. sent with a copy of his order

19/8/94

The Jurors answering to their names
as before sworn by the Sheriff's Substitute
have viewed the Lands and Premises
fixed upon for the Site of the Lands.
The Judge then directed the Jury to be
discharged from further attendance on
that
Service and the Jurors and the Lands
Owners Agents Counsel & Solicitors
withdrew to their Lands ——

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು

ಯು ಯು

21-8-94

(10)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
365

L.R. 136-94-2

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯ ಕಾಯಿದೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಕಲಂ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯ ನಿಯಮಗಳ ನಿಯಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೆಲವು ಭೂಮಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ನೀಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

Gen. Serial No: 32.]

(11)

1894

No. 735

Name of Petitioner. A. Rangaraja Urs.

Village.

Taluk. Hunsur

District.

Date of Appl. September 1894

Date of Recpt. 4-9-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the Deputy-
Commissioner's order [illegible]
as per this office order No. 365 of [illegible]
The order appealed against is as follows
The assessment is in arrears. Pay
the amount according to the Huzur
request. And if there is any [illegible]
the matter it is to be decided in your
favour, the amount of assessment
remitted from your bill. Refund [illegible]

The petitioner urges—

That the Honorable Justices are requested
to quell all the Maharajahs Household Lands
& not from the Land belonging to Govt.

2. That it is stated in the Summons
that the said Village Ecclesiastique
pays entire rent & that the two
Kanals of Killemalli & Pallaglatha
are attached to the said Ecclesiastique
Village & so the Surveyor General Superintendent
had no right to seize the said Kanals
under the head of Inam Lands.

That it is only custom to cultivate the
land 17 acres & 3 guntas mentioned
in the Summons, after the good grass
grown there are made use for
the grazing of the cattle.

Prays therefore that the old
records in the Taluk & Hiri Jamabandi
Books may be kindly perused,
& the said Kanals may be separated
from the head of Inams Lands, & that
the Lands may be restored to him
to them in the Fasli Kattu
of 1887/4.

19.

30-10-94

(12)

L.R. 136-94-4

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. Cuddapah 1/92 (13)

Name of Petitioner. Cheeli Ningaraja

Village. Sort,

Taluk. Bagepalli

District. Bangalore.

Date of Arzi. 1 - 11 - 94

Date of Receipt. 3 - 11 - 94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 2 (two)

One Anna Stamp affd

ABSTRACT.

As called for in Office Enclosure dated 30-10-94, from originals of orders appeal against (orig. orders kept in the Inspt. General Revenue Dept. Commissioner, Bangalore) re Levy of assessment on Inam Lands of Venkatagiri Zam

W8

Petition

Council case

L.R. 136-94-15

Cuddapah 9/11

Whether Secretary

Inspector Revenue Dept. Bangalore 4/11

Cadastral Survey Inam Settlement 15/11/94

Assistant Officer Dept. 30/11/94 4/11

Appeal Case 365-35

In time Fourth Appeal

Petr complainant that certain lands which belonged to the private estate of the late Venkatagiri Zamindar of which Petr family is Samasthanigaru he being granted as minor Inam he brought under the Rules vesting it in Inamdar. The Inam appointed Petr as follows:—

"On receipt of Quit-rent Regr from the Sheristadar Office forwarding this as Inami Inam Sub Office forwarding Statement from the Tahsildar of Tavanidi Statement from the Tahsildar of Chandragiri as Inamdar to receive the Quit-rent in respect of Inam lands under the "Inam Rules" in force in Inam & the same annexed to be entered in Inam Register in the Sub Office. In the case is included in the Sub Office Inam Register of Inam Lands Mr. Thomas Inam Settlement Officer"

Petr complainant that certain lands which belonged to the private estate of the late Venkatagiri Zamindar of which Petr family is Samasthanigaru he being granted as minor Inam he brought under the Rules vesting it in Inamdar. The Inam appointed Petr as follows:—

"On receipt of Quit-rent Regr from the Sheristadar Office forwarding this as Inami Inam Sub Office forwarding Statement from the Tahsildar of Tavanidi Statement from the Tahsildar of Chandragiri as Inamdar to receive the Quit-rent in respect of Inam lands under the "Inam Rules" in force in Inam & the same annexed to be entered in Inam Register in the Sub Office. In the case is included in the Sub Office Inam Register of Inam Lands Mr. Thomas Inam Settlement Officer"

Pet 763

49

22/11/94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

(14)

PETITION DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 365, 735 & 119 dated 3rd July, 1st & 2nd Sept 94 received at the Dewan's Office from Clerk Lingarajapa Zemindar Fort, Mysore, appealing against the Survey Superintendent's order treating certain lands granted by H.H. the late Maharaja, to Petitioner's family as Sarvamanyam, as Inam lands & bringing the same under Rule relating to Inam lands & forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Inam Superintendent for Inam Settlements, for submission of proceedings connected with the case.

L.N. 136-94-6

2. The Petitions & Sanads are returned.

By Order,

Draft
Consider

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
15 Nov 14 1894

22

19/11

M.G.C.P, Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

Pet. Bk
1/12/94

1894.

From

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements in Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore.

Dated 29th November
Despatched 1st December
Received.

Returned for Copies
and Call for Proceedings
11/5/12

Drafted
SKR
6/12

L.R. 136-94-7

Enclosure No. 3

No. 53

Sir, In reply to his Special Memorandum No. 753 of the 15th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith, the original Inam Settlement Registers of Kalamalli & Gollenpatna Villages of Hosakoteyana Taluk, connected with Kiran Inam lands of Christian Coolies, and to state that the original Counterfoil Receipts granted in the said Registers have already been returned to the Private Secretary, respectively by the late Inam Superintendent.

2. The enclosures of the Memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Vol
954

10-12-94

57

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(16)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 365, 355 & 1/6
dated 3 Day, Sept, & 1 Nov 12-94 received at the
Dewan's Office from Inchia Ungarai
Pers, Tiri, Mysore Complaining
of levy of assessment on his
Inamlands in Kalenkalli,
Dattegalla, Kaveriapura
Taluk

L. R. 136-94-8

is forwarded, together with its three
enclosures, to the Dy. Commr
~~K~~ Mysore District, for infor-
mation of the entire
proceedings connected
with the case.

2. The petition and Memo
Encls. should be returned.

By Order,

Bcott

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
7-12-1894

7/12

6/12 12/6/12

M.G.C.P., Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

Chief Sec's no 423 & 23-8-86 and 79 the connected papers are herewith. Kite

Nos 2 & 3 to be filed with reference to Resolution 13/71 submitted 15th 22-7-95

5 2 ——— 189

OFFICE OF THE
14454
29 APR 95
3458
CHIEF SECRETARY OF MYSORE

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District. (17)

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Durbar~~ of Mysore.

Dated 24
Despatched 26 } April 95
Received

C-R-136-9-4-95

Enclosures No. { 1 File of Papers with the Petition & Cuttings.

No. 1179

Submits papers in the Dasara Cases in Kalkatalli Dasaraghatta, in the Krishnarajpet taluk, herewith to Chief Secretary Mys, Mysore

Pt Manch
29/4/95

No.

Enclosures No.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 24 April 1895.

26

From A Rangaswamy Iyengar Esqre.
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To Government
The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
Bangalore

SIR.

As requested in your Con no Pet/934 dated 7th December, I have the honor to submit herewith the correspondence received from the Sub Division officer, vide his no 988, of 7th Instant, in re the Inam Lands in Hullahalli Dabbegatta Krishnarajpet Taluk, belonging to Chick Rajaraj urs, of Mysore. The petition and enclosures received with the above, are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
A Rangaswamy Iyengar
for Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

Compd
elg

Shri H. Narasimhaiah
22-8-94
Vijayanagar City

Shri H. Narasimhaiah
22-8-94
Vijayanagar City

Court Fee Stamps Affixed

755R
4-9-94

ಅನುಬಂಧ 29

ಮನವಿ : 1

ಸಿ.ಎಚ್. ಹನುಮಂತರಾಯ ಅಂಡ್ ಸನ್ಸ್

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ವ್ಯವಹರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೀರಿಸಲು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೀರಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೀರಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳೆಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೀರಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಇರುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸಾಲಗ

ਸੁਖਮਨੀ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਰਚਨਾ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਰਾਗ ਗਉੜੀ ਵਿਚ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਵਿਚ ਚੌਵੀ ਅਸ਼ਟਪਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਹਰ ਅਸ਼ਟਪਦੀ ਦੇ ਅੰਤ ਵਿਚ ਇਕ ਸਲੋਕ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਇਕ ਸਲੋਕ ਮੰਗਲਾਚਰਣ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿਚ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਕੁਲ ਪਚੀ ਸਲੋਕ ਹਨ। ਸੁਖਮਨੀ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਰਚਨਾ ਦਾ ਮੁੱਖ ਉਦੇਸ਼ ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਨਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਵਿਚ ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਪੱਖਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਉਜਾਗਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਪੱਖਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਉਜਾਗਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਪੱਖਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਉਜਾਗਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ।

ਸੁਖਮਨੀ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਰਚਨਾ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਰਾਗ ਗਉੜੀ ਵਿਚ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਵਿਚ ਚੌਵੀ ਅਸ਼ਟਪਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਹਰ ਅਸ਼ਟਪਦੀ ਦੇ ਅੰਤ ਵਿਚ ਇਕ ਸਲੋਕ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਇਕ ਸਲੋਕ ਮੰਗਲਾਚਰਣ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿਚ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਕੁਲ ਪਚੀ ਸਲੋਕ ਹਨ। ਸੁਖਮਨੀ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਰਚਨਾ ਦਾ ਮੁੱਖ ਉਦੇਸ਼ ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਨਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਵਿਚ ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਪੱਖਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਉਜਾਗਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਮਹਿਮਾ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਗੁਰੂ ਅਰਜਨ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਪੱਖਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਉਜਾਗਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ।

طرح کا ہے کہ اس سے ہمارے ملک کی — اس وقت ہم کو ہندوستان میں

کسی قسم کی مدد نہیں ملتی — اس وقت ہم کو ہندوستان میں

— — — —

57

Pet 191

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No.s 365 & 1185 dated 1-8-94 & 12-11-94 respectively received at the Dewan's Office from Chikka Linga Rayeru of Mysore complaining that Shahzadie, Kalenahalli & Dabbeghutti Kavals in Krishnarajpete Taluk which had been granted to his family as Sarvamanya in 1827 have been treated as minor Inams and a large Sum has been charged thereon as Khaliat & are forwarded, together with their two enclosures, to the Superintendent Revenue Survey, Mysore for Submission of papers connected with the case. He was asked [illegible] Sarvamanya and [illegible] Inam [illegible]

~~The petitioner and their enclosures should be returned~~

[illegible] Inam [illegible] and that Sum was treated and charged as such.

By Order,

(Draft as per last Key cover)

23-7-95

Revenue Secretary.

BANGALORE,
23-7-1895

Rec'd 22-7-95

M.G.C.P., Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

ಕಂದಾಯ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕಂ ಇ ೨೦೧೬

ಯುದಾಸ್ತು–ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ [illegible] ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ [illegible]

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳ ಇನಾಮ್ ಜಮೀನಿಯೂ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಎಕ್ಸೆಸೆ ಕರಾರ್ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ, ಇನಾಂ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಹಜೀಯಿಂದ ಕ್ಯಾರೆಂಟ್ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಅನ್ವಯ:–

ಪಹಣಿಯ ಹೆಸರು.	ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಶೀಟ್ ನಂಬರ್.	ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಹೆಸರು.	ಶೀಟಿನ ನಂಬರ್.	ಇನಾಂ ಸೂಪರ್‌ಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ನಂಬರ್.	ಇನಾಂದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು.	ಇನಾಮಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ.	ಇನಾಂ ಸೆಟಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಬೀಜದ ನಂಬರ್.	ಕ್ಯಾಲ್ಕುಲೇಟಿಂಗ್ ಶೀಟಿನ ನಂಬರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ನಂಬರ್.	ಸರ್ವೇ ನಂಬರ್.	ಈಗಿನ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿ. ಖುಷ್ಕಿ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಖುಷ್ಕಿ. ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ತರೀ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ತರೀ. ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಬಾಗಾಯಿತು. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಬಾಗಾಯಿತು. ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜಾವ್ಮಾ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಜಾವ್ಮಾ. ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ನಂಬರ್ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದರ ನಂಬರ್. ಮತ್ತು ಪಾವತಿ.	ಇನಾಂ ಸೆಟಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ಕಾಗದದ ನಂಬರ್ ಮತ್ತು ತಾರೀಖು.	ಇನಾಂ ಸೆಟಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಕಾಗದದ ನಂಬರ್ ಮತ್ತು ತಾರೀಖು.	ಇನಾಂ.	ಸರಕಾರ.
೧	೬	೫	೮	೪		೬	೮	೭	೧೦	೧೧	೧೨	೧೩	೧೪	೧೫	೧೬	೧೭	೧೯	೧೯	೨೦	೨೧
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

ಮೀ।। ಜೀಫ್ ಕಮ್ಮಿಸನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಥರಾವ್ ನಂಬರು-ತಾರೀಖು ೧೨ ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಶಿವಂಗ ಸ್ಟ ೧೯೬೨ ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೇರಿಗೆ ಥರಾವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ. 63

ಹಿಡಿದಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರು ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಮತ್ತು ಜಮೀನಿನ ಹೆಸರು	ಮುಂದೆ ಅನಾಂ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.									ಖಾಲಸಾಹ ದಾಖಲಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.									ಇನಾಂ ಜಮೀನಿನಮೇಲಿಂದ ವಸೂಲಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.			ಪರಾ.
	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರು.	ಖುಷ್ಕಿ.		ತರೀ.		ಬಾಗಾಯತು.		ಜುಮ್ಲಾ.		ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್.	ಖುಷ್ಕಿ.		ತರೀ.		ಬಾಗಾಯತ್ತು.		ಜುಮ್ಲಾ.		ಜೋಡಿನ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಇನಾಮ್ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	
		ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.		ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.	ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಅಕಾರ ರೊಕ್ಕ.				
೨೯	೩೪	೩೫	೩೬	೩೭	೩೮	೩೯	೪೦	೪೧	೪೨	೪೩	೪೪	೪೫	೪೬	೪೭	೪೮	೪೯	೫೦	೫೧	೫೨	೫೩	೫೪	೫೫

ಮಾದರಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೨ ಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಕೋಷ್ಟಕ.

ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ.

| ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ. | ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಯ ಹೆಸರು. | ಶಾಲೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. | ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಹೆಸರು. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಲೇಖಕರು. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾಶಕರು. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ವರ್ಷ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಮುದ್ರಣ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಒಟ್ಟು ಬೆಲೆ. | ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಒಟ್ಟು ಪುಟಗಳು

ಮೆ।। ಜೇಫ್ ಕಮ್ಮಿಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ಠರಾವ್ ನಂಬರು—ತಾರೀಖು ೧೨ ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ಸನ ೧೮೭೫ ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೇರಿಗೆ ಠರಾವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ.

ಹಕ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ನಂಬರು ೯–೧೦–೧೧ ಕಾಲಂ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬರೆಯತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.	ಸರ್ವೇ ನಂಬರು.	ಮೀದೆ ಇನಾಂ ನಹೆಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಖುಷ್ಕಿ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ತರೀ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಬಾಗಾಯತು. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜುಮ್ಲಾ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಖಾಲಸಾಕ ದಾಖಲುಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಸರ್ವೇ ನಂಬರ್.	ಖುಷ್ಕಿ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ತರೀ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಬಾಗಾಯತು. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜುಮ್ಲಾ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಇನಾಂ ಜಮೀನಿನಮೇಲಿಂದ ವಸೂಲುಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಪಟೇಲನು ಸಂಬಳದ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಷರಾ.
೬೨	೬೪	೬೫	೬೬	೬೭	೬೮	೬೯	೭೦	೭೧	೭೨	೭೩	೭೪	೭೫	೭೬	೭೭	೭೮	೭೯	೮೦	೮೧	೮೨	೮೩	೮೪	೮೫
										23-19	5-12											
										೧೮೬	೧೪೬	೧೪						೧೪೬	೧೪			
										೧೮೭	೧೪೪೪	೧೪						೧೪೪೪	೧೪			
										೧೮೮	೧೪೪೪	೧೪						೧೪೪೪	೧೪			
										೧೮೯	೧೪೪೪	೧೪						೧೪೪೪	೧೪			

ಅನುಬಂಧ–ಸ್ಥಾವರಗಳಿಂದ ಹೊರಸೂಸುವ ಹೊಗೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣ ಹೇರಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವುಳ್ಳ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ನಮೂನೆ

ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಸ್ವರೂಪ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಅವಧಿ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಸ್ವರೂಪ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಸಮಯ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಸ್ಥಳ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಪರಿಸರ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಪರಿಣಾಮ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಣೆ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ವರದಿ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ನವೀಕರಣ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ರದ್ದತಿ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಪುನರಾರಂಭ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಪರಿಹಾರ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ.	ಸ್ಥಾವರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಅಂತಿಮ ಆದೇಶ.
೧	೨	೩	೪	೫	೬	೭	೮	೯	೧೦	೧೧	೧೨	೧೩	೧೪	೧೫	೧೬	೧೭	೧೮	೧೯	೨೦	೨೧	೨೨
೧.																					
೨.																					
೩.																					
೪.																					
೫.																					
೬.																					
೭.																					
೮.																					
೯.																					
೧೦.																					
೧೧.																					
೧೨.																					
೧೩.																					
೧೪.																					
೧೫.																					
೧೬.																					
೧೭.																					
೧೮.																					
೧೯.																					
೨೦.																					
೨೧.																					
೨೨.																					

the Beriz or assessment, t
is some force, although there
is no mention of the nature
of this realization in the
Nirup by His Highness
the late Maharaja granting
the two Kavals.

3 The petitioner states
that in 1874 an authorilative
measurement was made of
both Kavals under the order
of the Deputy Commissioner
and that the Bijwari was
as below:—

	K.	k	P.
Kalenhalli-	49	4.	2 ——
Dabegatta-	26.	14.	13 3/4 —
Total	75.	18	15 3/4

Computed roughly, allowing for wet and dry standard at about 750 acres

The actual areas by Survey in the two Kavals are as below

		acres	Rs	A	P.
Kaleinhalli-	Dry.	432.6	256.	8.	0 ——
	Wat —— "	——	"		——
	Gardan —— "	——	"		——
		432.6	256.	8.	0
Dabegatta	Dry —— "	——	"		——
	Wat—	27. 31	77.	8.	0 —
	Gardan —— "	——	"		—
		459. 37	334.	0.	0

ನಮೂನೆ 13ನೆ.

ಮಾದರಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕ—ಪಟ್ಟಿ ೨

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

ಹೋಬಳಿ

ಪಟ್ಟಿಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.

ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹೆಸರು.

ಸರ್ವೇ ನಂಬರ್.

ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂಬರ್ ಅಥವಾ ಪೈಸಲ್ ನಂಬರ್.

ಆಕಾರ ಪೈಸಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂಬರ್‌ಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.

ಪಹಣಿಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.

ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು.

ಆಕಾರ ಪೈಸಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂಬರ್‌ಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.

ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು

ಪಿಟಿಗೆ ಜೀಪ್ ಕಮ್ಮಿಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ ತರಾವ್ ನಂಬರು—ತಾರೀಖು ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಸನ ೧೯೧ ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೇರಿಗೆ ತರಾವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪತ್ರಿಕ್ಕೆ.

ಪಟ್ಟಿಂಗ್ ನಂಬರು ೯-೧೦-೧೧ ಕೊಡಿಕೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ಇನಾಂ ಕಾಯಂದರು ಮಾಡಿದರು.	ಸರ್ವೇ ನಂಬರು.	ಮುಂಬೆ ಇನಾಂ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಖುಷ್ಕಿ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ತರೀ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಬಾಗಾಯತು. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜಮ್ಮಾ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಸರ್ವೇ ನಂಬರ್.	ಖಾಲಸಾಕ ದಾಖಲಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಖುಷ್ಕಿ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ತರೀ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಬಾಗಾಯತು. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜಮ್ಮಾ. ಎಕರೆ ಗುಂಟೆ.	ಆಕಾರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಇನಾಂ ಜಮೀನಿನಮೇಲಿಂದ ವಸೂಲಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಪೆನಾಸುಂಕ್ ಜೋಡಿಸಿದ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಸೆಸ್ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಜಂಬ್ಲಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ.	ಷರಾ.
೮೯	೭೪	೭೫	೭೬	೭೭	೭೮	೭೯	೮೦	೮೧	೮೨	೮೩	೮೪	೮೫	೮೬	೮೭	೮೮	೮೯	೯೦	೯೧	೯೨	೯೩	೯೪
	೧೧	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	೪	೧	-	೪೬೧೦	೧೦	-	-	೪೬೧೦	೧೦			
	೧೧	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	೯	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೭೮	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೭೮			
	೧೧	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	೨೨	-	-	೪೬೪೨	೧೪	-	-	೪೬೪೨	೧೪			
	೧೧	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	೪೪	-	-	೪೬೪೧	೧೯	-	-	೪೬೪೧	೧೯			
	೧೧	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೧೨	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೧೨	೧೧	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	೧೧	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೬	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೬	೨೨	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೬	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೬			
	೧೧	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೧೨	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೧೨	೧೧	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೧೨	-	-	೨೬೪೬	೧೨			

Supdt Sukthellysore Revenue Survey

in any of the accounts o

extent of the lands now

question but the Berin

assessment being distinct

mentioned in the accounts

from year to year, the latter

was taken as the basis of

definition

8 The Petition and Inam

settled Registers are herewith

resubmitted.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedt Servant

H Pratt

Supt Tellyporam Red. Survey

Pet 1/207

Enc: 2 Inam Reports and 3 Petns with their Sanc

68

Docket

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

To The Asst Revenue Survey Commr Mysore

His Letter No 450 dated 1-8-95 with Petn

on ~~The accompanying~~ Petition No. 3 365 and

to be obliquely returned 1187 dated 1-8-94 and 12-11-94 ~~received at this~~ repeatedly

~~Dewan's Office~~ from Chicka Ranga Rao of Mysore complaining that Mahadeva Kalenahalli and Doddahulla Kaval in Krishnarajpet Tk ~~obtained~~ granted to his family as Sarvamanya in 1827 have been treated as Minor Inams and a large sum had been levied as Assessment thereon and praying that

are forwarded, together with ~~the~~ two

enclosures, to the Superintendent

L.R. 136-94-12 of Revenue Survey in Mysore,

for ~~the~~ report ~~if any question arises~~ from ~~him~~ as to ~~the~~ ~~Inam is involved in~~

~~the~~ attention of the Survey

~~Supt is requested particularly~~ to

the allegation of the petitioner that

the money value recorded is only

the realization of the Stubble

grass and not the Berij or

assessment, ~~He is further requested~~ to

to state how the extent

of the Inam was defined if there

was no mention of the extent

or assessment in the Inam

~~By Order, &c~~

By Order, &c

for Revenue

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,

189

2/12/94

M.G.C.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000

(General Serial No. 30.)

1896.

Gl. No. 655
Ex. 569
3 MAR 96
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From

The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

To

Revenue

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt. of Mysore.

Dated Bangalore 2nd

Despatched March 1896

Received

Enclosures No. one file of papers

General No. 486

No.

In reply to General letter dated 29th

SUBJECT. No 207

January 1896

Reporting upon the petition of Ishak Sirajulla of Mysore complaining that the Khalsa and Sirkari lands in the Krishnarajpet Taluk have been levied as Alienated Lands

~~References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).~~ and a large sum demanded thereon as Kandayam—

Pet
3.3.96

Petition Book
3/3/96

Submitted
3.96.

L-R-136-94-13.

Submitted with reference to 2nd Commissioner's note in the office note.

AS.
10/3/96

10—3—96

As the Inspector proceeds to enquire into all the facts & submit a complete report. Meanwhile recovery of the collection of the Khalsa arrears in dispute should be stayed.

12/3/96

12/3/96

Draft docketed
AS 14/3 RO. 13.3.96
Draft
14.3.96

70

No 886

Survey Department Office
Honolulu 24th February
2nd March 1886

To,

The Honourable Secretary to the
Government of Hawaii

Sir,

I have the honor to submit
my reply to your letter of the
Ult. dated 21st January 1886
1207
on the petitions of Kaleiha
Luiga Elua of Hilo and con-
cerning that the Kaleiheiki
and Waiaeaeha Kuaola in the

the Kingdom may fall to Rome
seem retarded or otherwise impeded
and a longer time elapse
thereon in Christ.

2. If any find no pleasure
for trusting the same Kingdom
otherwise than as otherwise known
best, as regards the future in
regard that the management
again which the actions and
counsel, is only the realization
of the activity good, and not-

the

4 I received Register of Calcutta, receipt dated 14th ult, date of Journal 15th ult, and 23rd July resp.

that in the case of neither Record was the area mentioned in the Record of the accounts and that the would be defined by the Survey Department

5 I certainly think that Rs 43.5 suggests an account rendered likely to represent the

last sheet Being of roads which
from their nature, at the time
of Road Laid, must have
been extensive

6 I would suggest in
enquiry Being made into the
true facts of the alleged Short
measurement in 1924. By course
of that year it would have
will be no "Short" Laid as
the Roads was measure a
good deal Less by Survey

7 There Being no mention
in

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

—पुढील वर्षी पुन्हा भेटू—

80 ಶ್ರೀ

ಅನುವಾದ – ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಿನಾಥ ತೀರ್ಥಂಕರರ ಪಾದಪದ್ಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಕ್ತಿಯುಳ್ಳವನಾದ

ಈ ಶ್ರೀಪಾಲ ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಯು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಭೂಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದನು. ಅವನು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಶತ್ರುಗಳನ್ನು

ಸೋಲಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಸಂಪತ್ತನ್ನು ಅಪಹರಿಸಿದನು. ಅವನು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಸಂಪತ್ತಿಗೆ ಒಡೆಯನಾಗಿದ್ದನು.

ಅವನ ಪಟ್ಟದ ರಾಣಿಯರು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಗುಣಗಳಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಶುಭಲಕ್ಷಣಗಳಿಂದ

ಕೂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಸೌಭಾಗ್ಯಗಳಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಸಮಸ್ತ ಸಂಪತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ್ದರು.

87

2 drafts

(29)

To.

The Supt^g of Rev Survey
in Mysore

dated 14th March 1896.
Recd 17

RK / 1724

Enc: 2 Sanad Regd^s
3 Petitions with Encs

L.R.136-94-16

This letter No. 886 dated 2nd March 1896 reporting on the petn of Chik Linga Raj of Mysore complaining of the levy of Khaloot on his Inamlands in Kalambalii and Wadeghatta Hamalo, Krishnaraj pet Taluk,

With reference to para 6 of the above suggesting an enquiry being made into the true facts of alleged Taluk measurements in 1871 has the honor to request that the Supt^g Rev Survey will be so good as to make the necessary enquiry into

into all the facts, and favour Govt with a complete report.

2. The enclosures of the above are returned.

By order

C2 draft 14/3

Secretary

14/3/96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO. 1157
DATE 12-11-97.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
CAMP
REG'D. NO.
DATE

1237 1743 of 95

Gen
18/2
W.R.K.

83

Please put up the file relating to the subject containing the D.M. to Survey Supdt. and subsequent correspondence if any.

Dt
22/4/96

L. R. 136-94-17

Dupe in Custody

Dt
25/2

Urgent Memorandum & case papers returned herewith - early

Dt
29/2

Open file made & acted

Dt
9/3

One anna Stamp affixed

The Survey Supdt's report which had been called for is also submitted herewith.

AS
10/3/96

Reader in Survey Supdt's No. 886

Dt
12/3/96

1896 (27)

No. 2854

Name of Petitioner, Gurrala Lingappa and 4 others

Village, Raja Peta - Cuddapah

Taluk, Jammalamadugu

District,

Date of Arzi, 7-2-96

Date of Receipt, 12-2-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 5

ABSTRACT.

That the heads of Dudekunta, Kondakunta and Dubagunta in Nallacheruvu pasumulk formerly belonging to Bhimgiri and in 1827 A.D. granted in Inam to Gurrala Venkatappa Nayudu by the Collector of Cuddapah Deputy Collector of Jammalamadugu and Tahsildar of Kamalapuram that the said Inam land was measured in 1827 A.D. and found to be 20-4-3-0 acres and that of Dubagunta 3-8-3-0 acres and that of the said Inam lands 20-4-3-0 acres and that of the said Inam lands 3-8-3-0 acres total 24-0-6-0 acres that the Survey Department accidentally omitted to enter the Inam lands in the Survey Register and that the Petitioners applied to the Survey Department to enter the Inam lands in the Survey Register and that the Survey Department refused to do so on the ground that the Inam lands were not entered in the Survey Register at the time of the Survey and that the Petitioners have no other means to get their Inam lands

85

86

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition

Registered No. 2854 dated 9-2-96

received at the Dewan's Office from

Chikka Linga Raja of Mysore praying for an order [illegible] to collection complained of by the levy of the disputed Khalsat on his Inam lands in Kalanhalli and Kathegal L.R. 13-9¼-15 Kanals, Krishnarajpet Taluk [illegible] in original

is forwarded, together with its enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District for disposal, with a request that the collection of the Khalsat aforesaid may be held in abeyance pending final orders on the petition.

By order,

for Chief Secretary

BANGALORE, 14/3

189

14-3-96

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—500

89



From The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

To The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue and General Dept.

Dated 18th March 1896.

Despatched

Received

General No.
No. 1168

L.R. 136-94-17.

Enclosure No. Seven.

Reporting on the petition of
Thiru Lingaraj Urs of Mysore.

C.P. March
21/3/96

21/3

Submitted.
24/3

No. 1165.
Enc. Petition No. 2854.
with six enclosures.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Mysore District.
Dated Mysore 18th March, 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your Official memorandum Rev. 1716½ dated the 14th March 1896, forwarding the petition of Chick Singaraja of Mysore and directing that the collection of the Khalsa amount on his inam lands in Kalamahalli and Doddeghatta Hamlets in the Krishnarajpet taluk may be held in abeyance pending final orders of Government on his appeal, I beg to state that the Sub-Division Officer of French Rocks has been requested to stop the levy of the amounts till the receipt of Government orders on the subject.

2. The petition and its enclosures received with the above memorandum are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obd. servant,

Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

Compd.
Ilkw.

MYSORE DENIM & COFF
PETROLEUM PARTNERS
DATE 19-12-96

(26)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ/ಸಿಆರ್‌ಎಂ/ಟಿಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್/ಸಿಆರ್-೧೨೩/೨೦೨೩-೨೪/೪೫೬೭ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೫.೦೩.೨೦೨೪

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ವಜಾಗೊಳಿಸಿದ ಆದೇಶ

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ಬಿನ್ ಲೇ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ, ಚಾಲಕ ದರ್ಜೆ, ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೭೭೨೧೪, ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡ ಬಸ್ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣ ಘಟಕ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಇವರು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಮದ್ಯಪಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಬಸ್ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬ ಆರೋಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ ೦೨.೦೩.೨೦೨೪ರಂದು ಅಮಾನತುಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಮಾನತು ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಜೀವನಾಧಾರ ಭತ್ಯೆಗೆ ಅರ್ಹರಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಅಮಾನತು ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರ ಕೊನೆಯ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವ ವಿಳಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ನೋಂದಾಯಿತ ಅಂಚೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಮಾನತು ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ

| | | |

2nd March 1896 I gave particulars
regarding the actual area by
Survey of the lands claimed in
the two Kavals alluded to —
amounting to a total of 459-37 A G
assessed at Rs. 334. I also held
out some hopes that the alleged
authoritative measurement of
these lands in 1874 would —
throw some light upon the
question now at issue. I can
find no trace of such alleged
measurement. Nor can I find
that the Sanad itself, whatever
the presumption may be, —
supports the allegation that
the money value recorded was
only

only the realigation of the stubble grass and not the berij or assessment.

3 It is worthy of notice that the Dabbegatta Kaval is not mentioned in the Sanad at all, but only the two Kavals of Kalenhalli and Ichalgudde. However the Vasulbaki accounts of Khara, 1831-32, seem to have been accepted by the Inam Department as follows.

Ichalgudde P 11-6-" } = Rs. 43-5-5
Kalenhalli P 3-3-" }
Dabbegatta P 2-4-" = Rs. 6-15-9

Inam Registers were prepared for Kalenhalli and Dabbegatta alone but the berij of Ichalgudde Kaval P 11-6-" was included in

ـــــــ

٥٠٠٠

Rough Translation of Amildar's Report dated 19th December 1896

One Simapa of Kikeri tendered a Dharkhast in the year Dundubhi (1862-63) for lands known as Jangamkatte lands attached to Maddapur Shobli Krishnarajpet Taluk being given to him for cultivation at 4 annas per kudo of land. The Shekdar was directed to make a "Pymashi" of these lands and report on the subject. He reported that the lands measured 10 Khandis 17 Kudas and 9 annas wet and that of this extent a portion measuring 1 Khandi and 18 Kudas

2 Inam
3 Patelan

Kudas was formerly cultivated
on Battai tenure in the
year Vikrati (1830-31) and
yielded 10 Khandis 18 Kudas
and 12 Padies of paddy -
which was valued at Kanti=
-rai 8 pagodas and 2 fanams
at the time of Jamabandi
of the year but the lands
were not cultivated since.
The Shekdar was thereupon
ordered to make over the
lands applied for to the
applicant viz Sindpa,
provided there be no other
"Takaders" and obtain a
Muchalika from him binding
over

Genl Bs

Pleasant sh Refs

101

Gen. 30.]

1898

35

10/10/98

Director:—

Pl. see the papers in regard to

Journey

Dated 13/10/98

Seen

14.10.98

From The Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore.

Genl B, Revl Depts

Subd & sending with Minute

Cont.

3/11/98

L. Dis 136-94-18

Dated 6th October 1898.

Despatched

Received

Enclosure No.s 5

General No. 259

No.

In reply to Correspondence ending with the Govt's Cir No. 1724 dated 2nd March 1896

SUBJECT

Reporting on the claim of Chik Linga Raj Ekrs of Mysore to the Kalenkalli Dasoregatta and Achal-gudde Rawals Krishnaraj-pet Taluk.

Minute

It will give much trouble if the family enquired is heard at the usual manner

1/12/98

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Returned

7/12/98

Regd

8/10

what authority it has been so done. The said petition was referred to the Amildar for report.

4 The Amildar then called upon the Mutsaddy referred to to produce documents to prove that the Kawal in question formed a portion of the Inam to Ling Raj Urs. The Mutsaddy deposed to say that he is not in possession of any Sanad or other accounts but the fact of enjoyment of the Kawal by the Urs uninterruptedly for many years past is itself proof of the right and that his Master is in possession of all the accounts

accounts in connection with the Kaval. He also alleged that in the year Vikrati (1830-31) when one Lingegauda was Shekdar of Govindankalli a portion of the Kaval was given out by him for cultivation but the fact having been brought to the notice of the then Amildar Sivaramaiah he reprimanded the Shekdar and ordered not to interfere farther with the Kaval as it is an Inam to Ling Raj Urs and that this is fully known to Kavalgars Ranga and Gidaga who maybe examined if required.

5— The village Shanbag was then

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 6th ~~September~~ oct. 1898.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen'l, Rev. Dept.

Sir.

In accordance with
instructions contained in your
letter $\frac{\text{Ft. A. Rd.}}{\text{No 1724}}$ dated 17th March
1896 I have the honor to report
upon the petition of Chikka Linga
Raj Urs, of Mysore, complain-
=ing of the levy of "Khalsat"
on his Inam lands in Kalan-
halli and Dalegatta Kavals
Krishnarajpet Taluk.

2 In my letter No. 886 of the

2nd

in the Kalenhalli Register.
There is no question about a
certain amount of Kerij having
been recognized by the Inam
Department in each of the Kavals,
Kalenhalli, Dabbegatta and
Ichalgudde as above shown. —
There is, however, no mention
of extent either in the Sanad
or in the accounts and we
have only the Kerij to guide
us.

4 I will show now what the
Inamdar claims as Inam,
as against the Kerij of Rs 50 5 2

in connection with the Kawal in question.

Setting forth the above evi-dences the Amildar addressed the Deputy Commissioner on 2nd Nove 1862 in reply to his Hukum referred to in Para 3 and requested instructions whether the Kawal lands should be allowed to be cultivated by Sirdars the Dar-khastdar or treated as hereto-fore as property belonging to Luiz Raj Ekra and reported that in the meantime the Kawal land will be kept un-cultivated.

9 The proceedings of the case having been referred to the Assistant Supt. for dis-posal he directed the Amildar to

to hold further enquiry in
the matter and obtain and
forward any Sanad which
may be in possession of the
Inamdar granting the land
as Inam and also orders issued
by the Amildar declaring
the lands to be Inam and that
no cultivation should be carried
on therein

10 When the Mutsaddy
of Limy Raj Ekes was questioned
about the above points he
pleaded that the Sanad of the
Kawal was missing and that
no written order was issued by
Amildar. The Amildar reported
the fact to the Assistant Supt
and

Name of Karal	Amount of Berij admitted by Inam Department	Land claimed by Petitioner		Remarks
		Area	Assessment	
	Rs. as. ps.			
Kalentiadi	43 . 5 . 5	432-6	256-8-0	Berij of P4 includes P6 of Ichalgudde Karal
Dalbegatta	6 . 15 . 9	27-31	77-8-0	Kkhast-land
Total assessed	50 . 5 . 2	459-37	334-0-0	
Add unassessed land				
Kalentiadi		100. 4		
Dalbegatta		35. 2		
Ichalgudde		1014. 0		
Grand Total	50 - 5 - 2	1609 1809. 3	334-0-0	

It is unnecessary here to allude to the extent of the above reserved as Khalsa; what we have to do is to consider the claim of the Petitioner to the very large extent of 1809 acres 3 guntas of which 459 acres and 37 guntas are assessed.

5. The accounts show that Petitioner

is

is entitled to land bearing an assessment of Rs 50. 5. 2. It is argued and I think with some justice that this levy of Rs 50. 5-2 was a kind of Kulkani assessment. The Petitioner's usufruct of the Karal lands and his claim generally has, from time to time been disputed, but his enjoyment of the grazing of the lands claimed by him has never been really interfered with. In Dabbegatta the whole of the land claimed by Petitioner is wet land and of course his claim to this is inconsistent with a claim based upon a kind of Kulkani tenure, but with the exception of these lands in Dabbegatta the whole

while of the rest of the land claimed is, although assessed by the Survey, really uncultivated dry land, the grazing of which has been enjoyed by the Petitioner for a very long time.

6. The case is not an easy one to settle satisfactorily. If the claimant claims the land on full rights as contained in the Survey Guarantee, he cannot complain of the excess which has been charged. If he seeks to explain how so large an area is held on the payment of so small a Beij, by asserting that the tenure was somewhat of the character of Hutbani or grazing assessment, then he cannot claim the

the full rights of Survey tenure.
7 I consider that Ethirisinga
Raj Urs should pay full assess
ment upon 27 acres 31 guntas
assessed at Rs. 77. 8. 0 in Dalbe-
-gatta, that the 432 acres 6 gunt
in Kalenhalli assessed at
Rs 256 - 8. 0 which are practicall
waste should have the assess-
ment struck off and that in
the whole of the unassessed land
in the three Kavals, Kalenhalli
Dalbegatta and Ichalgudde -
Government should permit -
Ethirisinga Raj Urs to enjoy the
grazing with however the reserva
tion that Government retains
the power to give out land for
bona fide cultivation up to a
certain

Kavalu to
exempt only
that on which
[illegible]
Wells and
Superstructures
[illegible]
Cocoanuts

Kavals viz Ichalgeo, Kalenkalli and Dabegatta are shewn as Inam. It is now too difficult to understand as it was long long ago how the Dabegatta Kaval was entered in the account as Inam although the Samud makes no mention of it. But as there is reference in the accounts it has to be presumed that Dabegatta kava formed an Inam and the Inamdar was enjoying it from the beginning. If the then Amildar had properly examined the accounts or the Inamdar had produced the Samud at the first instance the matter would have been easily disposed of then. The Amildar further reported that

that in consideration of all
these facts if it can be decided
that the Kawal belongs to the
Inamdar he may be compensated
with the grant of fresh land
equal to the extent now given
out to Sirdar and others for
cultivation.

14 Thereupon the Deputy
Commissioner Hassan Dt.
issued a final order No. 224
dated 31st March 1864 that the 3
Kawals, Dabegatta, Chalgude and
Kalenhalli should be held as
Inam to the Elsen according to
the terms of the Sanad.

15 Subsequently during
the ~~Survey~~ Inam Settlement the
following extent of lands belonging
to the Kawals were taken over
to Government and assessment
levied

certain area say 1000 acres.

I append a rough translation of Amildar's Report dated 19th Dec. 1796 which may be of some use in explaining the state of this rather complicated case. Enclosures are re- × 2 Inam Registers
3 Petitions
-turned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant

Asst Mysore Res. Survey.

over that he will be prepared to pay whatever assessment that may be imposed by the Superintendent Land Revenue Officer and it was accordingly done.

2. The Darkhastdar when he attempted to till the lands in question was prevented from by one Kanchi Kundgar residing in Margaonkalli on the ground that the lands formed Raja Amrat Adhil Kawals and his own cattle grazed on them from the beginning The matter having been reported to the Talukdar the Kundgar in question was sent for and

extent have been assumed.

No	extent	assessment
97P	0.18	0.4.0
98	13.1	5.8.0
102	18.6	14.0.0
103	14.14	9.0.0
104	14.23	11.0.0
105	16.9	11.0.0
106	16.32	10.0.0
107	15.16	7.8.0
108	14.2	8.0.0
109	17.7	9.8.0
111	12.0	8.0.0
112	13.17	10.0.0
113	8.17	6.0.0
114	7.0	5.0.0
115	16.16	12.0.0
	194.18	126.12.0

The Ichalgud Kaval has been treated as one sp and shewn in the "Sud" as follows:-

Survey sp	Total extent	of which treated as Kaval	Nat extent
1	1043.	40.20	993.20

17 The records in connection with the Dabegatta Kaval were searched for and the Vatturesi or Pahani accounts found from the year 1849-50 exhibit no extent or assessment of this Kaval but in some years the Kaval is shewn therein as "Raja

"Raja Amrat Mahal Kaval"
in some years as "Hattis" or
household Kaval but between
the years 1873-74 and 1882-83 it
is shown as "Linganj Uresi
waste." Subsequently two numbers
more are added on to the Kaval.
The Petitioner is leasing out
the Kaval as pasture land. A
large number of Toddy Trees
is standing on it.

18 It is not understood
what references were produced
by the Inamdar during Inam
Settlement and on what date
the settlement was made. There
is no extent given in the Title
Deed but only the following
details.

	No of Title Deed	Amount
Kalenhalli	253/342	43. 5. 5
Dabegatta	346	6. 15. 9

During

and examined. He stated that he neither saw the Darkhastdar at the Kavals nor forbade him from cultivating them; that the Kavad belonged to Ling Raj Urs and that his cattle grazed on it.

3 Venkatappa Amat Mahal Shirastadar of Ling Raj Urs in the meantime complained to the Deputy Commissioner by petition that Dabegatta Kavad lands belonging to his Master have been given over for cultivation to Simpa by Sirkar and requested under what

that summoned and examined.
He deposed that he has been
officiating as Shanbag from
the year Khara (1831-32);
that he knew the Kaval to be
the property of Linj Raj
and not Sirkar lands;
that he is not personally
aware of the portion of the
Kaval having been cultivat-
ed in the year Vikrati but
that Assige Patti shows the
fact and that the lands were
not cultivated since

6 The two Kavalgars Ranga
and Gidda allege that for
the last 20 or 30 years the
cattle belonging to their mas-
ter Linj Raj Urs graze upon
the

the Kavals.

7 Lingegauda states that as there was grass standing on the Kaval ungraged he thought that it formed Gomal waste land and caused a portion of it to be cultivated on Battai tenure but the fact having been brought to the notice of the Amildar he was severely reprimanded and ordered not to meddle with the land in future.

8 The old Gumastas of the Taluk were also enquired into but they stated that there was no document or record in the Taluk Cutcherry in

and founded a claim obtained from the Ryots wherein they stated that they are owners of the Inamdars cattle grazing in the Kaval for the past 30 years.

11 Thereupon the Assistant Superintendent passed the following Orders on the 3rd July 1863

Considering all these facts it is evident that Ling Raj Rao has not moved his cattle to the Kaval by Samad or other documents that his cattle might have grazed in the Kaval along with the village cattle as Sirdar Sanjar; that this alone fact might not retain his right over the land and that therefore it is not feasible to form an opinion that the Kaval belongs

Petn
21/1/95

135

23/1/97

GL. No. 4461
JAN 21 '98
Pet No 271
DEWAN'S OFFICE

General Serial No. 30.

1899.

(37)

From The Supt: Mysore Rev Survey

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Gen & Rev Depts

Dated
Despatched
Received } 20th January 1899

Enclosures No. one Docket

General No. 453
No.

Secretary's docket No 4801 dated 17th Instant
P. F. 59 of 95

L. R. 136-94-20

Has the honor to return the Vernacular Records regarding the Kavals of Kalenhalli and Dabe-gatta in the Krishnaraj-pet Taluk received with the Secretary's Docket No. Pet 59-95 of 24th August 1896.

Supt. Mysore Rev Survey.

belonged to him on the face of the evidence to show by record that the land was once cultivated and the produce was enjoyed and disposed of by Government. Under these circumstances Lingaraj Elu should be informed that there is no proof to show the land belonged to him & the land should be made over for cultivation to Sivadas if he is willing to take up or to any body else that may offer for it"

12. Subsequently on the 9th November 1863 the Mutsaddy of Lingaraj Elu again addressed a petition to the Deputy Commr. Khurda representing that the

Land

Inquisition relating to the
Land which was missing has
been now found and a copy
of it is forwarded and that on
reference to it the Land may
be continued as Inquisition before.
The said petition was
referred to the Auditor to re-
quire and report why the
Inquisition was not originally
produced before the Assistant
Superintendent when called
upon

13 The Auditor said further
inquiring and reported that the
Mutteddy stated that the
Inquisition was misfiled and was
now found so it was not produc-
ed originally. The original
Inquisition was returned to the
Mutteddy

Mutually retaining a copy thereof. The Account so rendered was perused. It is dated 31st December 1829 and states that only two Rawals belonged and Kalambatti containing 2 Berij of 19 Pagodas and 3 fanams have been granted Inam, but no mention is therein made of the Dubegatta Kandi under dispute. The Accountant having stated that Dubegatta Kandi was included within the Boundary assigned as Inam and that the accounts should be referred to, the Amildar caused the accounts to be examined. In the Paudbaki and other Jamabandi accounts of the years Sarvajit the 3

Rawals

leased on them :-

	Extent	Rent
Of Kavanballi Kavel Nos 6, 19 & 61		5.0.5.2
Dabegatta Kavel Nos 7, 9, 10 & 11 deg	1.17	10.12.3

15 In 1882 when the Survey Settlement was made no mention was made of Dabegatta Kavel as Inam either in Jodi Patak or other accounts but in account No 8 (the Vaidbaki) the following details were shewn :-

Survey No	Extent	Rent	Remarks
4	4.10	10.0.0	Extent. The Amildar should send for the Inamdar & have this dis- posed of in this pleasure. If he does not present him- self within a month from the date of notice this
6	2.39	7.8.0	
53	4.27	14.0.0	
54	5.29	18.0.0	
55	3.33	12.0.0	
56	3.31	9.8.0	
57	2.22	6.8.0	
	27.31	77.8.0	

settlement will hold good.

Out of the above the follow- ing extent has been returned.

Survey.

Survey- Extent Rent

Survey-no	Extent	Rent	
4	4.10	10.0.0	As regards the Survey-nos 3 now under dispute it has been decided in "Khasli" and remarks passed
6	2.39	4.8.0	
53	2.24	14.0.0	
54	5.29	19.0.0	
56P	0.8	0.8.0	
57	2.22	6.8.0	
	20.15	56.8.0	

in the "Jodi at Patak" to the effect that the grass growing on it should be sold annually.

The following extent has been given against Khandkalli in the Jodi at Patak

Survey-no	Extent	Rent
86	16.7	11.0.0
87	16.13	10.0.0
88	13.20	7.8.0
89	17.15	7.8.0
90	13.1	9.0.0
91	8.28	4.8.0
92	12.3	6.0.0
93	14.32	7.8.0
94	12.2	4.8.0
95	13.29	7.8.0
96	36.25	18.0.0
97	11.26	6.8.0
98	13.1	5.8.0
99	17.1	11.0.0
100	12.2	8.8.0
101	15.2	11.0.0
102	18.6	14.0.0
103	14.14	9.0.0
104	14.28	11.0.0
105	16.9	11.0.0
106	16.32	10.0.0
107	15.16	4.8.0
108	14.2	5.0.0
109	17.7	9.8.0
111	12.0	8.0.0
112	13.17	10.0.0
113	8.14	6.0.0
114	7.6	5.0.0
115	16.16	12.0.0
	432.6	256.8.0

Out of this Rent is the following

exlents

131

During Survey Settlement the Karais were removed and the extent found out. Then the lands were granted as Minor Inam the following details of them were shown in the Extent Register according to particulars furnished by the Talati=

Amount confirmed by the Settlement	Under cultivation						As per allocation made in the Survey Settlement						Brought under Cultivation					
	ac	g	A	G	P		ac	g	A	G	P		ac	g	A	G	P	
Subegatta	6.15.9	27	31	77	8	"	7	16	21	"	"		20	15	56	3	"	
Karaballi	43.5.5	432	6	256	8	"	234	29	129 /	12	"		197 /	12	126	12	"	
		459	37	334	"	"	242	4	150	12	"		217 /	33	182	4	"	

A remark has been written in the Statement showing the settlement of Minor Inam and that a sum of Rs 182.4.0 being Share as Kadar

G.O. No. R376 dated 22.11.79
" " R.779
" " 24755 " " 24.6.95
R.Dr.43.94
" " 24964 " 26.6.95
R.Dr.43.94
" " 1586-87 " 7.8.97
R.575

in the marginally noted proceedings, and this case does not fall within that category. The Inam in question has for its basis an administrative grant made by the late H.H. Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur in his Sovereign capacity and was properly dealt with by the Inam Deptt.

4). The question, then, has reference only to the legality of bringing the excess under Kharaab assessment. The Survey Deptt very properly gives weight to the contention of the petr that the so-called Beris is not properly the assessment under the Survey tenure but is a sort of Huttaki rent

rent. The alternative so-
-lution which has arisen
presents itself is described
by the S. Supdt in paras
6. and 7 of his letter No 259
dated 6.10.98 which are
quoted below.

* * * * * * * * * *

"Para 6. The case is not an
easy one to settle satis
factorily. If the claimant
claims the land on full
rights as contained in the
"Survey guarantee, he cannot
"complain of the excess
"which has been charged.
"If he seeks to explain how
"so large an area is held
on the payment of so
small a [illegible], by asserting
that the tenure was some
"what of the character
"of Hathbanni or grasing
"rent, then he cannot
claim the full rights
of Survey tenure.

132

Kassar Jadi But the Surveyor
now contends that the whole account
should be treated as entire Inam.

"Translation"

Supt Mysore Rev: Survey

133

1899

(36)

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

The Supt of Rev Survey in Mysore

Dated 17th January 1899.

Despatched 17

Received

(571)

General No. 4801

P.F. No. 59 of 95

L.R. 136-24-17

Enclosure No.

His letter No 259 Sth Sept 1898 requesting me to appeal of Chikka Deva Raja Urs of Nyasse, regarding the levy of Kharab cess on his Inam Kiwals of Kelavarahalli & Subbegatta in the Krishnarajpet Taluk.

With reference to the above I am to forward herewith ~~copy~~ a letter from the Amildar of Krishnarajpet dated 24-8-1898 forwarding the remarks called for in this office R.P. No. 759-95 and to request that the same may be sent to this office before the 5th proximo

to

to which date the appeal of Shri Lunga Raja Ram is fixed for hearing

By Order

Draft
Ben
16/1.

136

(38½) a

Urgent

1898-99.

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

The Supt of Revenue Survey
in Mysore.

Dated 4th February 1899.

Despatched

Received

General No. Ret P. (625)
F. No. 59-95

Enclosure No.

L.R. 136-94-21

His docket No 453 & 20-1-99 submitting the record relating to the appeal of Chikka Linga Raja Hero of Mysore, regarding the levy of Khalat on his Inam Kavals of Kalenahalli and Dabbegatta in the Krishnarajapet Taluk.

— o —

With reference to the above has the honour to request that he will be so good as to ~~forward~~ send the Inam Register Sheet of Kalenahalli village forwarded with this office No. Ret 1724 & 14th March 96. for reference in connection with the above appeal which is posted for hearing on the 13th instant.

By Order

4/2/99

For Secy

Dft
BLR. 4/2

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

Read:-

Petition No 365 dated 30.7.1894, presented by Chicka Linganaj Urs of Mysore, complaining that a large extent of the Kaval Kshalgudde, Kalena halli and Kabbaghatta kavals in the Krishnaraj pet Taluk, which had been granted to his father as Sarvamanyam in 1527, by H. Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur, ~~of~~ to his paternal Ryots ~~[illegible]~~ had been treated by the Amildar and charged with assessment as waste lands and that a large sum of Rs 1823-4-0 had been ~~[illegible]~~ -ged

L-R-136-94-23

Jagattalam ... Khalsa

129

2) Correspondence ending with docket No 535 dated 7.2.99, from the Supdt of Revenue Survey in Mysore, reporting on the above.

3). The records of the case

Order thereon No 6404-6 / RR 59-95 dt 9.3.00. (Y)

1) The claim is for the large extent of land marginally described, being declared Sarva Inam in favor of the petitioner (Y)

2). The Inam Settlement which has been already effected imposes a quit-rent of 2 annas on each Rupee of assessment. There was no specification of the situation of the land or its extent. The only datum for fixing the

(863)

		Area. A. g.	Assessment Rs. as.
Kalenahalli and Ichalgudde	Dry	422-2	256-8-0
	Ikhard	10-4	" " "
Dabbeghatta	wet	27-31	77-8-"
Total		459-37	334-00

unassessed lands.

	Acres.	gunta
Kalenahalli	100	4
Ichalgudde	1014	"
Dabbeghatta	35	2
Total	1149	6

Grand Total both assessed and not assessed — Acres gunta 1609 3

1140 the Inam which was available was the money value of the land. It was accordingly left to the Survey Deptt to fix the value and extent of the Inam and allocate it. The Inam was admitted by Maidan Inam, and was accordingly dealt with under the Rules in Govt Proceedings No 5046-54/Cir.128 dated 12.12.87. The petr had the benifit of the excess sanctioned in his favour and the rest was assessed as Khalsa.

3) The objection taken by the petr to the above settlement is on based on several grounds one of them is that it should not be treated as Minor Inam. Nothing has been urged in support of this ground which must

must therefore fail.

The next objection is that, being the Khasji kaval of H. H. the Maharaja's house hold and the alienation in favour of the petitioner of the Private Estate of the late Maharaja, the land in question should not be subjected to any assessment. This argument is not sound and must be rejected as being without any force. The principle that such lands are liable to be assessed when they pass out of the possession of the Palace unless there is a specific direction to the contrary, to be dealt with according to the circumstances of each case, has been recognised in cases quoted in

146

Para 2 I consider that
chik Linga Raj Urs should
pay full assessment on
upon 27 acres 31 guntas
assessed at Rs 77. 8-0
in Dabbeghatta, that the
432 acres 6 guntas in Kade
-nakalli assessed at
Rs 256. 8. 0 which are
practically waste, should
have the assessment
struck off, and that the
whole of the unassessed
land in the three lands
Kadenhalli, Dabbeghatta
and Ichalgudde, Govt
should permit Chik Linga
Raj Urs to enjoy the
grazing, with however
the reservation that Govt
retains the power to
give out land for bona
fide cultivation up to
a certain area, say 1000
acres.

acres." * * * * * This reasoning commends itself as being very fair and will may be adopted with a slight modification. It will be leaving the petitioner under vague and uncertain conditions if his tenure is made to depend upon the application by others for any portion of his land for cultivation. It would be more equitable to attach the condition to his own enjoyment. The assessment may be held in abeyance as long as the petitioner adheres to the terms of the Samad and enjoys the land only as pasture or grazing ground. But if he cultivates any portion of it the assessment on

lies

11/5 on such portion is thence
-forward to be levied.
Subject to this modifi
-cation the recommenda
-tion of the Survey Supdt
is approved and he
will be authorised to
revise the settlement
in either of the alternative
forms, that is to say,
either as at present
settled ~~if he so~~ or as pro
-posed by him whichever
may be accepted by the
petitioner. In any case
the Inamdar will have
no right to the large num
-ber of date and reserved
trees growing on these
lands.

11/3/00

C, and C2
20.2.00. Sd/-
Maybe passed

Secretary.

23.2.00

P.J.O

1) 20. The Dy Comr, Mysore Dt
with the order received vide his No
HT9 dated 24.4.95.
2). The Survey Supdt.
3) The Inamdar Supdt.

(862)

No. Pol 859-95 9.3.00. 10

Copies forwarded in reply to A. Lucyanz's Secs Post

Enquiries for information together with the enclosures of his petition & the original Sanad produced at the time of hearing

10-3-1900

Translation of the enclosures appended to

Press copy sent 13/3